

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XXII. No. 20.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, NOV. 14, 1812.

[Price 1s.]

[609]

[610]

## TO THE PEOPLE OF MANCHESTER,

*On the Speech of Mr. Canning, made at a dinner recently given him, in that Town.*

### PEOPLE OF MANCHESTER,

In the last number of my Register, I commented upon a speech of Mr. Canning, made at a dinner at Liverpool. I was myself satisfied with the exposure there made; but, seeing that he has brought forward some new tricks upon his stage at Manchester, it may not be amiss to make another exhibition of his pegs and wires.

From all the circumstances which I have been able to come at, I am satisfied that his inviters at Manchester, as well as at Liverpool, consisted of persons who thrive, and some of whom depend for existence, upon war and taxation. One might have thought, that such persons would not be thus forward in exposing themselves to the execrations of the people by insulting their miseries; but, the opportunity of triumphing in their success, in a conflict against the liberties of the people, appears to have been too alluring to be resisted.

The first part of Mr. Canning's speech consisted of lofty boasting of the *friendship*, the *kindness*, the *generosity*, which he had experienced in the county of Lancaster; and he affected to feel a deep sense of gratitude for the *honour*, as he called it, which had been conferred upon him. Whether he was able to utter this, or his auditors to listen to it, without bursting out in laughter, is more than I can say; but, they both well knew, that in their connexion, there existed no such thing as *friendship*, *kindness*, or *generosity*. They well knew that they were brought together by the desire which both had to fatten upon the public property. They sought a man likely to assist in the prolongation of war, the extension of the taxes, and the creating of emoluments in which they hoped to share, or in which they already did share; and he, on his side, sought for a set of people, who were able to give him a passport into Saint Stephen's, other than that of the sanction of a rotten

borough, though, in reality, the *people* of Liverpool, properly so called, have no more power to choose representatives than have the people of Winchester, or of Gatton. This boast of Mr. Canning was, therefore, as ridiculous as that of the ass loaded with holy relics, except that in the latter case, the boaster was not allowed to share in the profits of the fraud, in the carrying on of which he was an instrument; whereas in the case of Mr. Canning and his supporters, the basis of the alliance was that of *snacks*!

After a reasonable time spent in very nauseous self-congratulation upon his success at Liverpool, he came to speak upon the two great subjects, PEACE and REFORM; and, though I have observed in my last upon what he said on the subject of peace, I cannot refrain from making some observations here upon what he said at Manchester upon the same subject; because, upon this occasion, he went more fully into it, and laid down the principles, upon which he and the Wellesleys, and, indeed, the ministers and all the partisans of war, defend the continuance of the present system of foreign policy. We will here take a passage from his speech, which will enable us to judge of his views. He said, "that if the question was simply peace or war, all would be for peace; because all men know its value, and all men know the evils of war. But this is not the only question—HOW can PEACE, a Peace which will not, almost momentarily, lead to another War, be obtained?" —How can we obtain a Peace which will remove the distresses complained of by the Manufacturers, and which will open a permanent field for Commerce? Certainly, not by falling prostrate at the feet of our enemy, and throwing ourselves on his mercy.—It cannot be done by asking for mercy where there is none. That Providence having let the Scourge of Nations loose upon Mankind, we ought to submit to him, HE DENIED. The evil of War is great, but to secure a safe and honourable lasting Peace, the only way is for the Nation to put forth all its ener-

U



gies, and GRAPPLE FOR IT.—We have been told, said he, that Peace will *certainly* bring prosperity. Nothing can be more fallacious. The boldest apologist for our enemy, and the loudest advocate of his measures, could not deny, that by any peace that is not gained by successful war, we should gain nothing; for we should *leave all the power of mischief in his hands. With all the power of the Continent left at his disposal, he would still war against the commerce of this country, and continue the evils of which we have too much occasion to complain, but which a hollow peace will not remove.* His measures of annoying commerce, he would employ *to-morrow*, if we signed a peace with him *to-day*, and every soldier was withdrawn from the hostile contest.—Mr. Canning proceeded to say, that he could not for his part see how peace, not in the greatest degree dishonourable to us as a nation, *could be made.* He said, he did not pretend to say, that peace could not be procured, at any price—but he was sure it could not at this time, be obtained without dishonour. The hour after signing the articles of such a peace, every decree of the enemy against commerce might be repeated, and we then should have *no right to complain—no right to remonstrate.* Let the enemy retain *his present power, and the sealing of such a peace would be sealing our own condemnation.* Left with *all his powers* to apply to one object, our commerce *must fall.* Thus it appears, he said, to him, that the advocates for immediate peace must either submit to such a one as would degrade the nation into poverty and contempt, or begin a *new war* to repair the blunder of the peace too hastily made. When the ancient government of France existed, what Englishman would have risked such a peace? But how much more danger is there under the present order of things in that country, with the continental influence and power possessed by its present ruler, who, from his education, his habits, and his insatiable ambition grasps at so much, that merely for the sake of *self defence*, Great Britain is under the necessity of *contending for her share of the influence and power of the continent.*

If any thing had been wanting to convince me of the shallowness of Mr. Canning, this Speech, or rather the part of the Speech here extracted, would have been

quite sufficient for the purpose. After what has been said upon the topic in my last number, I will not longer *upon the cant* here again resorted to about Divine Providence having let loose Napoleon to scourge us; I will not longer dwell upon this specimen of detestable hypocrisy, of low mummery, than just to observe upon a new idea which the canting Speaker has introduced upon this occasion; which is this; that though Providence has let Napoleon loose upon us, we *ought not to submit to him*; but ought to grapple with him. The Right Hon. casuist does not appear to have made even an attempt to prove the truth of this doctrine, which rests solely upon his bare assertion. He tells us, that Providence has let Buonaparté loose upon us, and let him loose upon us as a scourge too. Now, it must be either right or wrong in Buonaparté to scourge us; if wrong, then is Mr. Canning, the pious Clerk of the Hanaper, the accuser of Divine Providence; if it be right in Buonaparté to scourge us, how dares the Clerk of the Hanaper assert that we ought not to submit to such scourging? If any neighbour lets his mastiff loose upon me, I kill the mastiff if I can; but then it is wrong in my neighbour to let his mastiff loose upon me, and I have a right to attack my neighbour for so doing. The case is just the opposite as to the employment of Buonaparté, unless Mr. Canning means to make him and Providence participators in the guilt. Besides, as I observed before, in all our King's speeches, and in all our prayers militant, we assume, that we have Providence on **OUR SIDE**, with which assumption Mr. Canning's doctrine is completely at war. The King in his speeches (and in those which are now made in his behalf), invariably holds forth to us the hope of success to be derived from the aid of Divine Providence. In like manner the prayers which we are commanded to put up on account of the war contemplate Providence as being on our side against a most wicked and bloody enemy. But, what wretched, what scandalous hypocrisy, would all this be, if the speech-makers and prayer-makers, believed with Mr. Canning, that this same Providence was not only against us in the fight, but actually had let loose upon us the very enemy against whom we prayed for protection?

People of Manchester! Listen to me a moment, while I explain to you the cause of this cant being resorted to by Mr. Can-

ning-  
see,  
your  
count  
He k  
He  
for t  
those  
ment  
their  
so gr  
peace  
you  
sessio  
own  
that  
is no  
gerou  
a mo  
curre  
in hi  
cause  
to acc  
that  
rupti  
resor  
ceive  
cy, a  
is Pr  
misfa  
enem  
to ob  
again  
"Ho  
were  
of Eu  
"sp  
seau  
Old  
give  
again  
prese  
"for  
ment  
chest  
mabl  
the s  
The  
fleets  
Gove  
we, j  
gove  
we  
beho  
been  
been  
are i  
war  
into  
lute





ning. He knows, that you cannot but see, that, within the last twenty years, your own lot and the situation of your country, are greatly changed for the worse. He knows, that you all feel that change. He knows, that your minds, in seeking for the *cause*, will naturally turn towards those who have had the powers of government and the resources of the nation in their hands. He has told you here, that, so great is the power of the enemy, no peace can be made with him; he has told you that to leave the enemy in quiet possession of what he has gained is to seal our own doom. In short, he has told you that France, formerly the rival of England, is now become so great as to make it dangerous for England to lay by the sword for a moment. He knew; it naturally occurred to his mind, as he was proceeding in his speech, that you would seek for the cause of this terrible change, and, in order to account for it upon grounds other than that of its having proceeded from the corruptions and follies of men in power, he resorts, as has been common with all deceivers in all ages, to a supernatural agency, and tells you, in plain terms, that it is *Providence who has been the cause of our misfortunes*, and who has let loose the enemy upon us. You cannot have failed to observe, that the war began with a cry against "Atheists and Deists." "Our 'Holy Religion' was in danger, you were told. We combined with the kings of Europe against an 'anti-christian conspiracy,' of which the immortal Rousseau had, we were told, been the founder. Old George Rose told us, that we must give our money in order to be defended against 'the enemies of God,' and to preserve to our children 'the blessed comforts of Religion.' But, why need I mention these things to the people of Manchester, who saw some of their most estimable townsmen's houses demolished amidst the shouts of '*Church and King*?' Well! The war took place; we sent forth our fleets and armies against those whom our Government called Atheists and Deists; we joined in a Holy league with the old governments of Europe against those whom we called the *enemies of God*; and now, behold! When league after league has been dissolved, when all our allies have been overthrown, and when we ourselves are in jeopardy, fearing the effects both of war and of peace, those who plunged us into the war, and who have had the absolute mastership of our resources in the con-

ducting of it; those men have now the impudence to tell us, that our enemies, that those same Atheists and Deists, those same foes of christianity, to form Holy leagues against whom they called upon us to give up our money; they have the impudence, the profligate impudence, to tell us, that those enemies have had, and still have Divine Providence on *their* side, and even that Divine Providence has let those enemies loose *upon us*!

Impudent as this is in itself, the full extent of its impudence is not seen till we come to view it in conjunction with other parts of the speech, and of the speech lately made at Liverpool. There the speaker boasts of our victories; there he talks of the wisdom of Pitt; of the success of his measures; of his repelling the storm; and of his *hushing to peace* that which threatened our destruction! If this were true, what ground could there be for the pretence, that Providence had let loose the enemy upon us?

The object of the passage above quoted, was to persuade those who heard it, that it was impossible to have peace until some part, at least, of the power of Napoleon had been taken out of his hands. Mr. Canning says, that if we leave Buonaparté in possession of his present power, the sealing of such a peace would be the sealing of our own condemnation. And he says in another place, that merely for the sake of self-defence, Great Britain is under the necessity of contending for her share of the influence and power of the continent. Supposing this to be true, what a confession is here! What a humiliating confession! What a complete answer to all our boastings about victories! What a stinging retort to all the firings of Park and Tower guns, and all the illuminations of tax-gatherers' houses! What, then, after being told, so many times, that we had obtained the absolute sovereignty of the sea, and had become masters of three quarters of the globe; after being told that our army had, at last, rivalled our navy; after all this; after all the votes of thanks by the Hon. House; after all the gold boxes and swords voted by the City of London; are we, after all this, to be told, that our enemy's conquests have so far outmeasured ours, that to make peace with him, leaving each party in possession of his conquests, would be to seal our own condemnation? This is, in fact, an acknowledgment of *defeat*, because it declares, that, in the present state of the parties, we dare not



make peace, which, as all the world knows, requires a greater reliance upon one's self, than is required to make war.

There is nothing which so decidedly proves the superiority of the enemy, as this fact of our not daring to make peace with him, leaving both parties in possession of their present power and dominion. We are like a gamester, that is to say, if Mr. Canning's assertion be true, who has been long at play, and who is ruined if he quits the table. We have lost the game; our adversary has triumphed over us; it is true that we still play on, but if we quit where we are, we are done for; and the only chance we have, is that of *getting back some part of what we have lost*. In short, we have, according to Mr. Canning, no remedy but the desperate one of contending for a reduction of the power of Buonaparté, for a diminution of that power which he has won from us and from all the sovereigns of Europe united.

And do you, People of Manchester, believe that the power of Napoleon is to be reduced by the Cannings, the Castlereaghs, the Wellesleys, and the Jenkinsons? Have you ever seen any thing in their measures, or have you ever heard any thing from their lips, calculated to excite such a belief? Do you believe that those who are unable to drive his armies out of Spain, while he himself, at a distance of thousands of miles from France, is subduing an Empire containing, perhaps, forty millions of souls, are likely to wrench from his grasp any portion of the power that he already possesses? If you do, you are in more than Egyptian blindness, and to remove the film from your eyes, were a task as difficult as that of bleaching the Ethiopian's skin.

But, is it true, what Mr. Canning tells you about the necessity of our regaining our *influence upon the Continent*, in order to *open a permanent field for our commerce*? In my opinion, nothing can be more fallacious. He tells you, that it is useless for you to have peace; that peace will do nothing for your commerce, because Buonaparté may revive all his decrees the next day. You will observe, that Buonaparté has offered to treat with us upon the basis of *actual possession*; that is to say, of leaving each power in possession of all the territory that it now holds. This being the case, there would, of course, be *terms*; there would be a mitigation of the great principle of the treaty. Besides, it would not be the interest of Buonaparté to exclude

our merchandise from the continent of Europe, if in those bales of merchandise were not packed up our *politics*, and our *intrigues against him*. These are what he dislikes; these are annoying to him, and of these he appears resolved to prevent the importation into his dominions, and into all the dominions over which he has any influence. This is a matter well worthy of the serious consideration of all those who are deeply interested in the success of commercial concerns. Mr. Canning labours hard to persuade you, that the enmity of Napoleon is to your *commerce*. "Left," says he, "with all his powers to apply to one object, *our commerce must fall*." And, therefore, he tells you, that you must keep on the war, till you have reduced the powers of Napoleon. He thus appeals to your self-interest, and, perhaps, with too much success. The same sort of efforts have been continually made, from the beginning of the war. But, the deceit is manifest. It is against the politics of England upon the Continent that Napoleon is at war, and not against her cloths, her shawls, her calicoes and her candlesticks. I am of opinion, on the contrary, that he would encourage a state of things in which England should be the workshop of Europe, provided he could, by a peace, made by frank and honourable men, obtain what he would deem a security against the introduction of English influence, leading to coalitions and wars. Commerce is a thing constituted of reciprocal advantages, and why should it be at all embroiled with politics? Why should not we exchange our wool, our tin, our copper, our steel, and our coals, of all which we have a superabundance, for the oil, and wine, and corn, and hemp, and other things of which we have none, or an insufficient quantity, and of which France and other parts of the Continent have a superabundance? The truth is, that there can be no reason why this sort of exchange should not be continually going on, and should not be as free as the air, except that governments have an interest, or, at least, think that they have an interest separate from that of the people. We at Botley, for instance, have more wool and more hoops than we can consume; but we have no claret, or Burgundy, or sallad oil; while the cultivators in France may have not half a sufficiency of wool and of hoops, and want a demand for their wine and their oil. Yet if we were at peace tomorrow we could not enter upon an exchange of these commodities, though so

man  
of th  
them  
load  
the y  
dear  
fortu  
The  
to se  
will  
men  
of c  
aimi  
worl  
must  
Ever  
poly  
time  
tend  
war.  
ever  
com  
in or  
ers.  
ral,  
it ca  
here  
to pu  
polit  
our a  
appe  
to d  
and  
to su  
merc  
tem  
depe  
carry  
pose  
Fa  
Han  
fore  
mean  
Con  
a mo  
is in  
by s  
the g  
from  
you,  
that  
that  
Con  
ment  
the p  
Mr.  
tend  
"pa  
pres  
com



manifestly advantageous to us on both sides of the water. Our articles would go to them, and their's would come to us, so loaded with taxes, that by the time that the wine reached our lips it would be too dear to be drunk, except by persons of large fortunes. Can there be any reason for this? There certainly cannot, and I hope to live to see the day when the happiness of nations will not be thus obstructed. Our government has always proceeded upon a system of commercial monopoly. It has been aiming at grasping the commerce of the world, not considering, that in the end it must thereby raise up a world of enemies. Every war appears to have had the monopoly of commerce in view, and at the same time the commerce seems to have been intended chiefly as the means of prosecuting war. We are the first nation that I have ever read of, who attempted to carry on commerce sword in hand, to fight nations in order to compel them to be our customers. Nothing surely can be more unnatural, and like every other unnatural thing, it cannot be of long duration. We have heretofore succeeded in compelling nations to purchase our goods and to yield to our politics: we have sent out our bales and our ambassadors under the same flag. It appears to me that we shall never be able to do this again. The world, both *old* and *new* seems to be in a humour no longer to submit to our system of enforcing commerce, and I am of opinion that that system is not at all necessary either to our independence or our happiness, nor would I carry on the war a single hour for the purpose of maintaining that system.

Far otherwise thinks the Clerk of the Hanaper. He tells you that you must, before you make peace, obtain by war the means of enforcing a commerce with the Continent, which, were it nothing else, is a most impolitic declaration, seeing that it is impossible that Buonaparté should not, by such declaration, be induced to make the greater exertions in order to prevent us from accomplishing such an object. I wish you, above all things, to bear in mind, that it is our *politics*, and not our *goods*, that Napoleon wishes to shut out of the Continent of Europe; and, that our government views the goods as nothing without the politics, is evident from the speech of Mr. Canning, who says that we must contend for "*our share of the influence and power of the Continent.*" This he represents as necessary to the carrying on of commerce with the Continent. But, is

there any truth in this representation? Has America any influence or power upon the Continent? Yet she has carried on, and still carries on, an immense trade with the Continent of Europe. America, it is well known, has never had any share of influence or power in England; but we well know how great has been her trade with England, how enormously great the commercial transactions of the two countries with each other.

It is, therefore, a gross delusion, that political influence on the Continent of Europe is necessary to us for the purposes of commerce; and, indeed, this is merely a pretence for the carrying on of the war; the real object of which war is, on the part of men like Mr. Canning, the support of corruption and the augmentation of its wages. Mr. Canning introduced the dispute with America upon this occasion, and said that "his opponents had expected, by the clamour they made about the importance of their measures, to have effected a triumph. They had prophesied peace with America, because we had made concessions to them. The Orders in Council were repealed to make the experiment. The experiment has failed. They had hoped to apply the success of the measure adopted towards America, to their arguments in favour of France; but they have found, and the nation is convinced, that concession and humiliation are of no avail."

Whether Mr. Canning's opponents at Liverpool had prophesied that the repeal of the Orders in Council would effect peace with America, is more than I can say. If they did so prophesy, it only proves that they understood less of the matter than I did; for I said from the beginning, that the repeal of the Orders in Council could not reasonably be expected to have such an effect. This opinion I maintained by arguments which I will not repeat, but which, as they were never answered, or attempted to be answered, except by personal abuse against myself, I concluded, and still conclude, to have been unanswerable. But, what ignorance, or what impudence must that man have, who talks of *concessions*, and *humiliating concessions* too, made by us to America? All the world knows, and we ourselves have many times acknowledged, that our Orders in Council were a violation of public law, though, as we asserted, they had been imposed on us as a measure of self-defence against the no less unlawful decrees of



France. We had declared repeatedly our sorrow for being driven to the adoption of such violent measures, and professed the anxious wish of our king to have an opportunity of imitating France in the doing away of regulations so injurious to America and so directly in the teeth of the public law of nations. Well! France repeals her decrees, and *we do not* follow her example until, at the end of a year and a half, it is proved at the bar of the Houses of Parliament, and proclaimed to the whole world, that the not repealing of our Orders in Council is producing infinite misery in our own Country. Then, and not till then, we repeal decrees which we had a hundred times over acknowledged to be a violation of the rights of America; and it is this repeal, this tardy measure, adopted under such circumstances, and notoriously for the sake of our own convenience; it is this measure, embracing only *a part* of the injuries complained of by America; it is this measure that Mr. Canning calls a *humiliating concession* to America; Upon a similar principle he would, I suppose, esteem it a great *favour* done to this insulted nation, if he, for any purpose of his own, were to *cease receiving* the salary attached to his sinecure place.

Yet, upon the fact of this measure not having produced peace with America, has Mr. Canning the assurance to ground the conclusion, that it is hopeless to attempt making peace with France! What impudence! What a contempt must he have had for his hearers and for the public! But, the truth is, that the bare circumstance of his having been invited to a public dinner, was quite sufficient to justify the belief, that he might, at Manchester, safely set decency and sense at defiance.

What similarity is there in the two cases? Admitting for argument's sake that we have made concessions to America, who is there that has ever asked the government to make concessions to France? Nay, the Emperor of France himself has asked for no concessions at our hands. He has surmounted any objection that he might have to treat even with such men as Castlereagh and Perceval; he has shown that his mind is great enough to subdue his pride; he has been the first to offer peace, founded upon a basis in which nothing like concession could be found; nay, so far from demanding concessions at our hands, his proposition implied *the leaving us in possession of Malta*, which, as the possession of Malta on our part was the ostensible

object of the war, was a real and no very small concession offered by him to us. How, then, does the case of America apply to that of France? And what ought we to think of the man who could resort to such sophistry for the purposes of deception?

To sum up the whole of Mr. Canning's doctrines as to war and peace, the amount is this, that we must keep on the war till we have diminished the power, and of course, till we have contracted the geographical limits of the sway of Napoleon. This, people of Manchester, is the opinion of Mr. Canning; this is the maxim of the set of politicians with whom he acts; this is the denunciation, I had almost said the curse, which he has uttered against this suffering country. I have shown, I think, that Napoleon may be left in possession of all his present power and dominions without any danger to us, provided the proper reforms are made at home. But, be this as it may, what prospect have we of obtaining a greater degree of security by reducing the power of Buonaparté? Those who believe the statements in the hired news-papers, will, of course, think that the prospect is very fair. Nay, they must think that his armies in Spain and Russia will soon be annihilated. To reason with such persons would be useless; for, if they were to hear of the entrance of the French army into Petersburg, and of the re-entrance of King Joseph into Madrid, they would turn for consolation to some new falsehood invented for the purpose of deceiving them. I shall, therefore, only add, upon this part of the subject, that it is my opinion, that, if we expend as many hundreds of millions as we have already expended in this war, we shall only thereby add to that power and to those dominions which it is the hope of politicians like Mr. Canning to be able to diminish; and, that after having swelled to an unbearable bulk the mass of our present miseries, we shall be compelled to make peace upon terms far worse than those which have been recently offered to us.

I now come to the part of Mr. Canning's speech, which relates to the state of the representation in parliament, and in which he touched upon the subject of parliamentary reform. This passage I shall extract at full length, in order that those who applauded its sentiments may have no room to complain of a want of fairness in my mode of proceeding. "On an occasion," said he, like the present, it would be



“ expected that he should say something  
 “ on the nature of our Constitution. He  
 “ knew that many well intentioned, and  
 “ well informed men too, argued *that there*  
 “ *are great defects in our Constitution.* He  
 “ did not think so. He thought it needed *no*  
 “ *alteration.* In addressing the largest un-  
 “ represented town in the united kingdom,  
 “ he should have hazarded the expression  
 “ of this sentiment with fear and trembling,  
 “ if he had not been aware, that he was  
 “ addressing men of sense and liberality,  
 “ who knew the value of being CITIZENS  
 “ OF REPRESENTED ENGLAND.—  
 “ [*Loud applause.*—The evils, which  
 “ are so loudly complained of, by some  
 “ men, he said, do not exist. Some men  
 “ think *that all power is lodged in the*  
 “ *House of Commons,* he must confess he  
 “ did not think so. It was the national  
 “ guardian, *to watch the ministers of the*  
 “ *crown ; it was the organ of popular opi-*  
 “ *nion ; it was to watch the interests of the*  
 “ *community ; to act as if delegated by the*  
 “ *whole nation ; and not as if composed of*  
 “ *Delegates from Independent States.*—  
 “ [LOUD APPLAUSE.] The House of  
 “ Commons, as now formed, he conti-  
 “ nued, cannot be altered without changing  
 “ *the very nature, and destroying the ba-*  
 “ *lance of the Constitution of the Country.*  
 “ They who contend for universal repre-  
 “ sentation, virtually say, *that the crown*  
 “ *itself should be elective.* They would  
 “ reduce the Constitution at once to a  
 “ *crowned republic.* Such innovations he  
 “ did hope and trust, would be resisted at  
 “ all times by the House of Commons,  
 “ with a voice of thunder that should be  
 “ imperative. He was not prepared, he  
 “ said, to say, *that some little amendment*  
 “ *might not be adopted with propriety in*  
 “ *the mode of chusing the representatives*  
 “ *of the Commons in Parliament ; yet it*  
 “ *ought never to be forgot for a single mo-*  
 “ *ment, that England has flourished under*  
 “ *the present Constitution,* with her re-  
 “ presentatives so elected, in such a way,  
 “ *that she has become the envy of all the*  
 “ *nations of the earth, for her singular su-*  
 “ *periority, and for the many blessings she*  
 “ *exclusively enjoys.*”

Mr. Canning is, perhaps, the most im-  
 pudent man, and he has, perhaps, more  
 of what is called *brass*, than any other  
 man, that ever addressed a public meet-  
 ing; yet, he never did, that I remember,  
 utter before any thing so impudent, so  
 insulting to the public, as this. Let us  
 begin with the downright falsehoods.—

1. It is a falsehood to say, that the Re-  
 formers (for it is us whom he manifestly has  
 in view) argue, that there are *defects in the*  
*Constitution.* We say the reverse; we  
 say, that the constitution is what we want;  
 and we say that the constitution gives us  
 what we now have not.—2ndly, It is a false-  
 hood to say, that we look upon *all power*  
 as being legitimately lodged in the House  
 of Commons. We say, on the contrary,  
 that the House of Commons ought by no  
 means to arrogate to itself many of the  
 powers that it now exercises; and we stren-  
 uously contend against its encroachments  
 upon the Royal Prerogative. 3dly, It is  
 a falsehood to say, that we aim at *making*  
*both Houses, and even the Crown elective ;*  
 it is a sheer, an impudent, an unqualifi-  
 cable falsehood; and he might as well have  
 said, that we aimed at placing the Lords  
 and the King to exercise legislative and  
 executive powers in the moon.

There was, in the speech, one attempt  
 at *deception.* The speaker resorted to the  
 old trick of representing the members of  
 the House of Commons as the REPRESENTATIVES OF ALL ENGLAND,  
 a trick which seems to have received great  
 applause. Let us, therefore, examine this  
 a little.

He told you, that it was unconstitutional  
 to consider the members as *delegates from*  
*independent states.* Well, and what then?  
 Who has ever contended that they ought  
 to be so considered? But, what has this  
 to do with the question at issue? We do  
 not say, that the members ought to be  
 considered as delegates from separate  
 states; we never amuse ourselves with any  
 such idle fancies. We say, according to  
 the dictates of honesty and common sense,  
 that they ought to represent the people of  
 England and Scotland and Ireland, who  
 pay taxes, because they have the power of  
 voting away those taxes; and, accordingly,  
 we say, that they ought to be chosen by  
 this description of persons, and that it is a  
 base and outrageous insult to our under-  
 standings to tell us that we are *represented*  
 by those in the *choosing* of whom we have  
 had nothing to do. We know, that, after  
 beating round through all the distinctions  
 and definitions respecting governments, we  
 find this position unquestionably true,  
 namely, that the only infallible mark of  
 distinction between *freemen* and *slaves*, is  
 this, that the former cannot have any por-  
 tion of their property taken from them  
*without their own consent ;* whereas the  
 property of the latter is subject to the ar-



*bitrary will of others*, who rule under the name of monarchy, aristocracy, &c. Accordingly, all the eulogists of our constitution of government, all those who have written about our freedom, have said, that *no Englishman is taxed without his own consent*. This is the great principle of the constitution of England. But, if what Mr. Canning says be true, this maxim is a mockery. In what way is it pretended that we give our consent to the taxes laid upon us? Why, to be sure, by the mouths of the members of the House of Commons; but, how can those of us give our consent in this way, who are *not permitted to vote for any of those members*? “REPRESENTED ENGLAND,” indeed! Citizens of represented England! So! This political empiric would persuade you, that you are represented by the members, elected at Gatton, St. Maws, and Old Sarum; that you are represented by men returned to Parliament in the same way that QUINTIN DICK was returned to Parliament! But, this is too impudent to speak of with any share of patience.

If the people of England are *represented* by men whom they do not choose; if the Town of Manchester, for instance, who submitted to the insults of Mr. Canning and his associates; if it be sufficient for the Town of Manchester to be represented by persons chosen without any participation on the part of the Town of Manchester, why should there be any elections at all; why should any town or any county have any thing to say in the Election of Members of Parliament; why might not the electors of Old Sarum as well elect all the members at once; or rather, why might not the minister of the day appoint the members of Parliament; in short, why should there be any Parliament at all? This is so glaring that it is unworthy of further comment; it is so impudent and profligate that it never could have been uttered but in the presence of men well known to be steeped in corruption to their very lips.

Mr. Canning concludes with the old assertion, that, whatever may be the defects in the representation, England has *flourished* under it; and that she has become the *envy of all the nations in the world*. A thousand times, at least, in the course of every year, I should suppose, this assertion is made by the hired authors of newspapers, magazines, reviews, and other publications, but I defy any one of these hirelings to point out a single instance; aye, one single instance, wherein this

“*envy*” has been made apparent. It is a falsehood; an old battered falsehood; a falsehood as gross as any of the frauds and rogueries of priests (before the reformation, of course,) and it is intended for much about the same purpose, namely, that of plundering the people. “*Envy of all the nations of the earth*,” indeed! And what nation has ever said that she envied us? For what do they envy us; “*For our singular superiority, and for the many blessings we exclusively enjoy*.” This prating gentleman did not think proper to be *particular* in the statement of these blessings; and I believe it would have puzzled him to have named one.

But England has *flourished*, it seems, under this mode of electing members of Parliament. And where are the *marks* of her flourishing condition? In the present state of the paper-money; in the two millions of paupers which are languishing in England and Wales alone; in the endless number of seizures made on account of default of the payment of the King's taxes; in the enormous burdens which the people have to bear; in the lists of Bankrupts which swell the Gazette; in the twenty years' war, which, after having destroyed all our allies, has made our enemy so formidable to us, that, even according to Mr. Canning's own declaration, though we are suffering by the war, we dare not make peace? But, it is to insult your understandings to dwell longer upon assertions so notoriously false; I, therefore, conclude, with expressing my hope, that the Town of Manchester may never again suffer itself to be disgraced by listening to a similar harangue; but, whether it does or not, I am quite certain, that the day is not far distant, when its industrious inhabitants will, with voice unanimous, execrate the day that gave birth to the faction whose principles were, with so much effrontery, inculcated upon this occasion.

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, Thursday, 12th Nov. 1812.

## PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

### MR. FAWKES TO LORD MILTON.

MY LORD,

The very decided opinions upon the subject of Parliamentary Reform, which your Lordship is reported to have lately delivered in various addresses to your Constituents, have been to me the source of much sur-



prise and concern—of surprise, because though I knew your Lordship entertained doubts, as to the practicability of the measure, I did not imagine you would represent it as a “*new-fangled Theory*,”—of concern, because I feel myself compelled publicly to differ from a man for whose public, and private character, I do, and have ever felt the greatest esteem.

It has been my anxious wish, my Lord, *on every account*, that some person more competent than myself, had entered the list on this occasion—but as no public notice seems to have been taken of your Lordship’s sentiments upon this head, I should think it a mean abandonment of the great cause I have most sincerely espoused, if I did not raise my voice, “*weak though it be*,” in opposing them.

Happily, my Lord, the authorities which have induced me to espouse the cause of Parliamentary Reform, lay in the narrowest compass—they are within the comprehensions of all ranks in society—there is nothing perplexed or mysterious about them, and your Lordship must hear them, where I found them, (if I have not been most egregiously deceived), in the voice of wisdom, and the laws of my country.

Your Lordship is reported to have said, in the course of your canvass, and on the day of nomination at York, “That in the last Parliament, one subject had been discussed, on which the *passions* of the people had been raised by *persons* who endeavoured to fill them with *fancies*, which had no *solid foundation*,”—“That, under the present constitution” (*the present practical one, I presume*) “you trusted, we shall ever be content to live without endangering it by *visionary improvements*,” and that “If any man in the *vanity* of his own heart, thought he could make a better constitution than the one under which we had so long lived and flourished, you trusted you should not be reckoned among his *friends* or *supporters*.”\*

The Reformers of England, my Lord, have not the *vanity* to suppose that they can make a *better* Constitution than the one under which it was intended they should live—they want *no other*, but they do want *that* Constitution, the essence of which consists in two points:—

- 1st. The English Constitution provides, That no man shall suffer punishment in any way, unless he be guilty of an offence known to the laws.

2dly. That the property of no man shall be taken from him in the shape of taxes, without his *CONSENT*, or in any way, except for a just cause legally shewn.

These are the Rights and Liberties of Englishmen. How does the Constitution say they are to be preserved? By a third provision.

3dly. That the People shall be represented in a Commons ‘House of Parliament.’

Such, according to my conception, my Lord, are the great and solid advantages to be derived from the Constitution of England; and it is very easy to perceive, that as far as regards the safety either of the persons or property of the people, all must depend upon this—whether the members of the House of Commons be, or be not, really chosen by the people themselves—The friends of Reform therefore say:—

1st. That by the laws and statutes of this realm, the subject has settled in him a fundamental right of property, so that without his *consent* it shall not be taken from him.

2dly. That he shall not be compelled to contribute to any Tax, Talliage, or other like charge not set by *COMMON CONSENT* in *Parliament*.

3dly. That in Parliament all the whole body of the realm, and *EVERY PARTICULAR MEMBER* thereof, either in *PERSON* or by *DEPUTATION*, are by the laws of this realm supposed to be personally present.

4thly. That by the present state of the representation, the subject’s fundamental right of property is openly violated—since it is a fact which cannot be denied, that numbers are taxed by Parliament, who have no voice in the election of Members of Parliament.

The three former of those propositions the friends of Reform conceive they can establish by a reference to the Common Law and the statutes of the Land.

The ablest commentators on the laws and Constitution of England have never failed to dwell upon the security which they afford to the fundamental right of property, as one of their most distinguished excellencies, and as the strongest proof that they were founded in the principles of freedom.

Upon this principle Fortescue (Chancellor to Henry 6th, who wrote his celebrated treatise *de laudibus legum Angliæ*, expressly to instruct the young Prince in the laws

\* Leeds Mercury, Oct. 17, 1812.



and Constitution of his country) says, "That the advantage of that political *mixed* Government which prevails in England is, that no one can alter the laws, or make new ones, without the CONSENT of the WHOLE KINGDOM in Parliament assembled." Cap. ix. xii. xiv. xxxvi.

Upon the same principle Sir Edward Coke concludes, *passim*, "That the COMMON LAW of *England* settleth a freedom in the subject, and giveth a true property in their goods and estates, so that without their CONSENT or IMPLICITLY by an ordinance which they consented unto by a COMMON ASSENT in PARLIAMENT, it cannot be taken from them or their estates charged.

So much for the *Common Law*.

I shall now proceed to submit to your Lordship, the *Statutes* which the friends of Reform consider as confirmatory of the People's Right to be either PERSONALLY or by DEPUTATION present in the Parliament.

- 1.—53 William I. An. 4.
- 2.—Magna Charta, Art. 4.
- 3.—Magna Charta, confirmed by Henry III. c. 37.
- 4.—Statute of Westminster, An. 3 Ed. I. c. 5. where the King directs, upon pain of grievous forfeiture, since Elections ought to be FREE, "That no *great man*, or others, by force of arms, menaces or malice, disturb FREE ELECTION."—1. West. c. 5.
- 5.—Statutum de tallagio non concedendo 34 Edw. I. c. 1.
- 6.—25 of Edw. I.
- 7.—1 Henry IV. Parl. R. 1. No. 36.
- 8.—1 Henry IV. c. 3 and 4. Nos. 21, 22.
- 9.—7 Henry IV. c. 14.
- 10.—39 Henry IV. c. 1.
- 11.—Preamble to the 1st of James I. c. 1.
- 12.—PETITION OF RIGHT, 3 Charles I. c. 14.
- 13.—Declaration of the Prince of Orange, afterwards Will. III. Art. 18. "All ELECTIONS of Members of Parliament ought to be FREE—To be made with AN ENTIRE LIBERTY—without any sort of force, or the REQUIRING the electors to chuse such persons as shall be NAMED to them."—*King William's Declaration for restoring the Laws and Liberties of England*.
- 14.—The Bill of Rights—"Declaring that election of Members of Parliament ought to be free."—Bill of Rights, c. 8-13.

The pith and marrow of these early laws appear to have been condensed in the in-

troduction to that Act of Parliament which I have already cited, and by which the descent of the crown to James I. was recognized. "As we cannot (say the Lords and Commons of that day) too often and enough, so can there be no ways or means so fit both to sacrifice our hearty thanks to Almighty God, for blessing us as well with a Sovereign, adorned with the rarest gifts of mind and body, in such admirable peace and quietness, &c. &c. &c. as in this *High Court of Parliament*, where all the whole body of the realm and EVERY PARTICULAR MEMBER thereof, either in PERSON or by REPRESENTATION (upon their OWN FREE ELECTIONS) are supposed to be PERSONALLY PRESENT.—*Statute 1 James I. c. 1*.

Here, then, my Lord, the right of the nation to be represented in Parliament is recognised. This can be effected only in one of two ways, either *actually* or *virtually*. If our ancestors had meant to recognise no more than a *virtual* representation, it would have been sufficient if the statute had said, "That in Parliament all the whole body of the realm are *deemed* to be present either in *person* or by *representation*." Now, with the additional words, the sentence tells us not only that the whole body of the realm are deemed to be in Parliament by Representation—but every PARTICULAR MEMBER thereof PERSONALLY, or in his PERSONAL RIGHT by REPRESENTATION. Now, is it possible to contend, that these additional words expressed no more than a right to a virtual representation? are these words to be considered as a mere surplusage? Is there no difference between the proposition, that the nation has a right to be present in Parliament as a CORPORATE BODY, and that which affirms that every individual of that nation has a right to be present in his PERSONAL CAPACITY?" If, then, this sentence has different meanings, as it is either with or without the additional words—if these meanings are not only different but repugnant—if without the additional words, it would affirm, the right to a *virtual representation*, which is our opponent's proposition, and if with the words it would declare a right to an actual Representation, which is our principle; and if, in fact, these words are a part of the statute, then must the inference be in our favour;—then we are bound to conclude, that they meant to do that, which in point of fact they have done, by this memorable statute—assert the *Right* which the People of England have, by their Constitution and Laws, to a REAL and ACTUAL parliamentary representation.



Surely, then, my Lord, it is burning day-light to prove, that the *old* Law did intend to entail upon the whole body of the realm, and every particular member thereof, the great *Right* for which I contend. Could, however, the policy which dictated the laws, or the laws which declare the policy of our forefathers, stand in need of additional support, the proudest and most venerable authorities which the English name can boast, are at hand to give it. Let us, then, my Lord, place Mr. John Locke in our front rank—Mr. John Locke, the avowed champion of that "*ancient constitution*, (as your Lordship observed) *established at the Revolution, and which may be considered as the consolidation of our liberty.*"

"Thus, to regulate Candidates and Electors," (*i.e.* according to the mode which prevailed before the Prince of Orange arrived, a mode too similar to our *present practical one*) "what is it," says this great Englishman, "but to cut up the Government by the roots and poison the very fountain of public security. For the people having reserved to themselves the *Choice* of their *Representatives*, as the *Fence* to their properties, could do it for no other end, but that they might always be *Freely Chosen*, and so chosen, *freely act.*"—*Locke on Government*, p. 2, and 222.

Mr. Locke appears to have caught the above metaphor from Sir E. Coke, 4 Institute, 23, where he says, "Thomas Long gave the Mayor of Westbury four pounds to be elected Burgesse. This matter was adjudged in the House of Commons, *secundum consuetudinem Parlamente*—the Mayor fined and imprisoned, and Long removed. For this *Corrupt Dealing* was *Poyson* to the very *Fountain* itself."

Tempora mutantur, however, my Lord, these things, we are now told, are as "*notorious as the Sun at noon-day*," and the Mayor of Westbury, doubtless, at present makes his return without any apprehensions.

"Whoever understands the theory of the English Constitution (said Lord Chat-ham), and will compare it with the practice, must see at once how widely they differ. We must reconcile them to each other, if we mean to preserve the *LIBERTIES* of this Country; we must reduce our *Political Practice* as near as possible to our *Political Principle*. The English Constitution intended that there should be a *Permanent Relation* between the *Constituent* and *Representative* body of the People; will

any man affirm that that is now the fact? that that relation is preserved?—My Lords, it is not *Preserved*, it is *Destroyed*."—See Debrett, v. v. p. 154-5.

"A Borough, (on another occasion, exclaimed this great patriot), which, perhaps, no man ever saw, this is what I call the *Rotten Part* of our Constitution.—It cannot continue a century; if it does not drop off, it *must be amputated*."—See Debrett, v. iv. p. 291.

"Nothing can endanger our Constitution, but destroying the equilibrium of power between one branch of the Legislature and the rest. If ever it should happen that the independence of any one of the three should be lost, or that it should become subservient to the views of either of the other two, there would be an end of the *Constitution*."—Blackstone.

"Nor, my Lord, is the doctrine *New*, (said Lord Camden), it is as *Old* as the *Constitution*; it grew up with it; it is its support. *Taxation and Representation* are inseparably united. God hath joined them. No British Parliament can put them asunder—to endeavour to do it is to *stab our vitals*!"—Lord Camden's Speech on American Taxation.

"It is material to us (said Mr. Burke) to be represented *really* and *bona fide*, and not in forms and types, and figures and fictions of law. The right of election was not established as a mere matter of form, it was not a principle which might substitute a *Titius* or a *Marius*, a *John Doe* or a *Richard Roe*, in the place of a man specially chosen, not a principle just as well satisfied with one man as another. It is a *Right*, the effect of which is to give to the people that man and *that man only*, whom by their own voices *Actually* not *Constructively* given, they declare that they *know, esteem, love, and trust*."—Thoughts on the present Discontents, p. 304, 305.

"The Constitution of this country (exclaimed our virtuous and patriotic countryman, Sir Geo. Saville,) reminds me strongly of an ancient and stately oak near my house, though to all appearance green and flourishing without—is all *ROTTENNESS* and *CORRUPTION* within."

"The defect of Representation (said Mr. Pitt, in 1782,) is the national disease, and unless you apply a remedy directly to that disease, you must inevitably take the consequences with which it is pregnant.—Without a Parliamentary Reform, the nation will be plunged into *NEW WARS*; without a Parliamentary Reform,



you cannot be safe against BAD MINISTERS, nor can even Good Ministers be of use to you—No HONEST MAN can, according to the present system, be Minister."

"That corruption and patronage had overspread the land—that the King's name was frequently prostituted by his Ministers—that Majorities were found to support the worst measures, as well as the best—that through Parliamentary Reform ALONE, we could have a chance of rescuing ourselves from a state of extreme peril and distress,"—was the solemn declaration of Mr. Fox.

To the eloquent and recent appeals of Mr. (now Lord) Grey, and to the Petition of the Society called the Friends of the People, praying for Parliamentary Reform, and which may now be found upon the table of the House of Commons, I need not call your Lordship's attention.

Nothing can be farther from my intention than to say any thing bearing the least semblance of unkindness to a man, whose *intentions I believe to be perfectly upright*, and whose sincerity is unquestionable; or I might here perhaps be allowed to ask your Lordship on what foundation these late changes have been made against the Friends of Reform? Whence these denunciations, which to many a mind may have given considerable pain, of persons seeking for *visionary improvements*, and "*raising the passions of the people by attempting to fill them with fancies which had no solid foundation.*"—To shew my Countrymen that the Reformers of England conceive they have "*some foundation, and that a very solid one too,*" for the cause they have hitherto pursued, and in which I trust they will persevere to the end, is the only object of this letter; and I trust, after the statement I have made, that the friends of this measure will hear no more complaints on the score of "*MODERN INNOVATION.*"

In endeavouring to effect this, I have not trusted to my own speculations and inquiries—I have rather chosen to submit to your Lordship's view the learning and the researches of others. If I should have succeeded in condensing, without injuring its force—in giving it "*a tangible shape*"—in placing within every man's reach those valuable documents, in which he will find his great prerogative—his RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE in a FREE PARLIAMENT, recognised in the laws of his country—I shall feel satisfied in having done some trifling service to the cause I have espoused!

Your Lordship is reported to have said at Leeds—"If by Reform is meant the removal of any *Corruption* or *Abuse*, that may have *crept* into the *mode* of electing Members of Parliament; or any thing which affects its INDEPENDENCE, no man is more friendly to it than I am."\*

Now, my Lord, is not Borough Patronage an abuse?—What says the great champion of your Lordship's favourite measure, the Revolution, Mr. Locke?—What says the Declaration of that Prince whose avowed intention it was to RESTORE the Constitution of England?—What says the Bill of Rights itself!—To what purpose, if the present practice is constitutional, the first and solemn resolution passed when Parliament assembles, a resolution which as yet has never been impugned—"That for a Peer to INTERFERE in the election of a Member of Parliament, is a gross infringement of the Rights and Privileges of the Commons of Great Britain."—Is it not, my Lord, in direct opposition to these statutes and authorities that the supposed right is founded which gives to 182 individuals, in a population of fourteen millions of people, calling themselves free, the dangerous privilege of selecting a majority of those, whom they think best fitted to fulfil the great and sacred duties of legislation?

Perhaps it may be argued that the Borough Proprietors have an interest in serving their country, and that though they do nominate for Boroughs, they do not neglect the "*common good.*" How the Patron sometimes finds his interest consulted by the disposal of seats, is very satisfactorily explained by Bubb Doddington in his Diary. And Doddington was possessed of all the qualities which are now considered necessary for a Legislature—"a great Landholder—a great Officer in the State—eminent for his knowledge, eloquence, and activity."—(See Paley's *Moral and Political Philosophy.*)

"I believe (said this *Right Hon.* Patron) there were few who could afford to give *His Majesty Six Members for nothing.*"—"Mr. Pelham declared that I had a good deal of MARKETABLE WARE (Parliamentary interest) and that if I would empower him to offer it to the King without conditions, he would be answerable to bring the affair to a good account."—Pages 282, 308, Diary. What was this account?—"The Treasureship of the Navy, he says,

\* Leeds Mercury, October 10, 1812.



the price of his seats."—*Volgato imperii arcano!*—What has happened, my Lord, once, may happen again—What has occurred in one instance, may take place in one thousand.

It is not, however, always the Patron's practice to dispose of his seats to his relatives or friends, or persons on whose integrity he can reckon.—They are a commodity in the market—they are avowedly and repeatedly on sale to the best bidder—the way, therefore, is as open to the monied adventurer as to the English Gentleman. Mr. Pitt roundly affirmed in his day, "That the emissary of a Tartar Prince had eight seats among the Commons of Great Britain,"—having thus an equal weight there with the County of Middlesex, and the Cities of London and Westminster. Now, my Lord, are these colours of sufficient force to paint this dreadful enormity?—What but a Parliamentary Reform can shield us from a repetition of these attacks?—For the same inlet through which the rupees of Mahomet Ali Khan, insinuated his Agents into St. Stephen's Chapel, are still open, and if your Lordship's arguments are valid, ought *not to be shut* against *any intruder*.

These two cases however cannot attach to your Lordship, for no man can harbour the remotest suspicion, that either your Lordship or your Lordship's family will ever act from interested motives. Let us then consider the last and only remaining case, let us suppose the Borough Patrons to be actuated solely by the *purest* and most *undivided* love of their country, still there are very forcible reasons why the power should not be lodged where it is at present. *Great Property*, my Lord, is not *always* coupled with *sound judgment*. The best of us, (and the Borough Proprietors are not exempt from the common lot) have *our Partialities!* For a variety of reasons, therefore, it is obvious, that the "*Common Good*" should not be at their disposal.

I shall pursue this subject no further. Upon the authority of our illustrious ancestors, who were the proud actors in that "*great but necessary violation of the law*," by the operation of which "*a Tyrant was cashiered for misconduct*," and upon the *Bill* they passed *declaratory* of an *Englishman's rights*, I fearlessly take my stand upon a rock, from which I trust "*the puny breath of modern dialectics*" will never be able to shake me. I contend either that the present practice is *WRONG*,

or that "*THE BILL of RIGHTS*, with every preventive regulation which our ancestors with parental anxiety suggested in the days of simplicity and truth, to guard the *Freedom of Election*, ought to be cast into the fire as waste paper and rubbish.

Your Lordship has often demanded of the friends of Reform, to what period they would revert to seek for the Constitution of England. The Reformers, my Lord, will make answer, and tell you that the real Constitution, only with a much greater latitude of suffrage than is now sought for, existed from the earliest times to the famous disfranchising act of the 8th of Henry 6th. Since it appears by the latest inquiry into the early history of our country, that the Norman Conqueror made little or no alteration in the civil government of the country,—(See Sir W. Jones's admirable speech on Parliamentary Reform, Vol. 5 of his works,) a speech which ought to be deeply studied by every friend to the measure; the speech of a man who was made up of religion, learning, and integrity; the speech of a man, of whom it was emphatically said, "*that it was well for the world that he had been born.*"

The Reformers will tell you, my Lord, that it was lost both in theory and practice, during the distracted times of the latter period of the 15th century—that it was kept down by the tyranny of the Tudors—that it spoke again, through its organ, the people, to two of the Princes of the house of Stewart—(see the Petition of Right,) that its balance was "*by the caprice and partiality of our Kings, from Henry 6th to Charles 2d gradually vested in the inferior boroughs*"—(see the Yorkshire Memorial, 1782,) and that it would have effectually and proudly raised its head at the "*Glorious Revolution*," had not the Prince of Orange bullied those of whose lives, liberty, and property, he professed himself the friend and defender.

For the real history of the Bill of Rights, I must request your Lordship to turn to Ralph's History of England, Vol. 2, p. 52. Your Lordship will there find that the Bill of Rights was only the Bill declaratory of our rights, and that it was to have been followed up by another, making specific provision to carry these rights into effect, which was defeated by the Prince of Orange himself, who roundly declared, that if Parliament insisted so much on limitations, he would return to Holland, and leave them to the *mercy* of King James. Thus, my Lord, to use a homely expres-



sion, *The Bill of Rights* was the *Bill of Fare*, but the *dinner* has not yet been served up!

That I should impute any *improper motives* to your Lordship, God forbid, but there may be an error of the *judgment*, as well as of the *heart*; and I could not hear the cause of Reform arraigned without making the best efforts in my power to interpose in its behalf. To your Lordship's arguments I have opposed those which have confirmed me in my opinions: both are now before the public, and in their present, as well as future views of this subject, that public must judge between us.

In addressing this letter to your Lordship, I have only taken the liberty, I have only exercised the right which the meanest of your Lordship's constituents possesses; when a man's country is at stake, he is no friend to it who suffers ceremony to sway him. I have endeavoured, however, to discuss the point with all the temper such serious subjects require. I have not, I trust, for a moment, lost sight of that respect which I owe and feel to your Lordship's *situation, public services, and private worth*, and though I may be in an error, (which I must share, should that be the case, with some of the most famous Parliament Statesmen, Lawyers, Jurists, and Moralists that England ever knew;) yet I shall think myself well repaid for the attempt I have made, if in explaining the causes of "the Political Faith which is in me," I shall have succeeded in persuading your Lordship, whose good opinion I very much value, that my mistake has not originated in thoughtlessness or vice.

I shall now, my Lord, bring this letter to a close, I have disburdened my mind, having, I trust, said enough to shew that Parliamentary Reform is not the "baseless fabric," your Lordship has represented it to be, and that a man, so long as any weight is attached to grave and virtuous authorities may entertain a conviction of its necessity, without labouring under the imputation of "vanity or presumption."

I have the honour to be,

MY LORD,

Very truly and faithfully yours,

WALTER FAWKES.

Farnley Mall,  
Nov. 6, 1812.

## OFFICIAL PAPERS.

*English Bulletin.*—(Continued from p. 574.)

Having learned that the enemy had occupied the town of Wolokolamsk, threatening by this movement my right flank, I immediately detached Colonel Benkendorff with the Cossacks of the guard, and the regiment of Tchermosonboff. I ordered him to reconnoitre the enemy, and to drive him away, if it be possible, from Wolokolamsk. I ordered Colonel Jelowskoy not to retire one step, that the enemy might not perceive my movement.—In the mean while, I have advanced with the whole of my detachment towards the town of Klin, and posted myself seven wersts off in the village of Davidofka, in order the better to support Colonel Benkendorff, and anticipate the enemy in his movements from Wolokolamsk towards Twer. Yesterday I received accounts from M. Benkendorff, that Wolokolamsk was only occupied by a part of the enemy, who have retired towards Roussa. I have ordered M. Benkendorff to post himself near Roussa, and to occupy the environs of Mojaïsk: and then, after having joined the detachment of Major Prendell, to act upon all the roads which lead from Mojaïsk towards the North.—This very moment, I have received from M. Prendell the intelligence of his having already had some affairs with the enemy. I am convinced that the movements of Major Prendell were the cause of the abandonment of Wolokolamsk by the enemy, who, according to Major Prendell's report, suffered great loss. He has sent me thirty-six prisoners.—To-morrow I shall myself advance towards the town of Woskreseuck, whence it will be easy for me to reinforce my advanced guard, which is at Tschernoy Grjas, as well as Benkendorff's detachment; at the same time I shall attain by this means my principal object, which is to cover Klein and Twer, as well as the road from Petersburg.

*Twenty-third Bulletin of the French Grand Army.*—Moscow, Oct. 9.

The advanced guard, commanded by the King of Naples, is upon the Nava, twenty leagues from Moscow. The enemy's army is upon the Kalouga. Some skirmishes have taken place for the last three days. The King of Naples has had all the advan-



tage, and always driven the enemy from their positions. The Cossacks hover upon our flanks. A patrol of 150 dragoons, of the guard commanded by Major Marthod, has fallen into an ambuscade of the Cossacks, between the road of Moscow and Kalougo. The dragoons sabred 300 of them, and opened themselves a passage; but they left 20 men upon the field of battle, who were taken, amongst them is the Major, dangerously wounded. The Duke of Elchingen is at Boghorodoek. The advanced guard of the Viceroy is at Troitsa, upon the road to Dmitrow. The colours taken by the Russians from the Turks, in different wars, and several curious things found in the Kremlin, have been sent off for Paris. We found a Madonna, enriched with diamonds: It has also been sent to Paris. We add here a statistical account of Moscow, which was found among the papers of the Palace.—It appears that Rostopchin has emigrated. At Voronovo he set fire to his castle, and left the following writing attached to a post:

"I have, for eight years, embellished this country house, and I have lived happy in it in the bosom of my family. The inhabitants of this estate, to the number of 1,720, quit it at your approach (1); and I set fire to my house that it may not be polluted by your presence. Frenchmen! I have abandoned to you my two Moscow houses, with furniture, worth half a million of rubles; here you will only find ashes (2).

"COUNT FEDOR ROSTOPCHIN.  
"Voronovo, Sept. 29."

The palace of Prince Kurakin is one of those which has been saved from the fire. General Count Nansouty is lodged in it. —We succeeded, with great difficulty, in withdrawing from the hospitals and houses on fire, a part of the Russian sick. There remains about 4,000 of these wretched men. The number of those who perished is extremely great.—We have had for the last eight days a warmer sun than is experienced at Paris at this season. —We do not perceive that we are in the North.—The Duke of Reggio, who is at Wilna, has entirely recovered.—The enemy's General in Chief, Bagration, is dead of the wound which he received in the battle of Moskwa.—The Russian army disavows the fire of Moscow. The authors of this attempt are held in detestation among the Russians.—They consider Rostopchin as a sort of Marat. He has

been able to console himself in the society of the English Commissary, Wilson.—The Staff-Major will cause the details of the battles of Smolensko and Moskwa to be printed, and point out those who distinguished themselves.—We have just armed the Kremlin with 30 pieces of cannon, and constructed *cheveaux de frize* at all the entrances of it. It forms a fortress. Bake-houses and magazines are established in it.

*Twenty-fourth Bulletin of the Grand Army.*

Moscow, Oct. 14, 1812.

General Baron Delzons has marched upon Dmitrow. The advanced guard of the King of Naples is upon the Nara, in the presence of the enemy, who is occupied with refreshing his army, and completing it by means of the militia.—The weather is still fine. The first snow fell yesterday. In twenty days we shall be in winter quarters.—The Russian troops in Moldavia have joined General Tormazow, those of Finland have disembarked at Riga. They came out and attacked the 10th corps. They were beaten; 3,000 men were made prisoners. The official account of this brilliant combat, which does so much honour to General de Yorck, is not yet received.—All our wounded have left Smolensk, Minsk, and Mohilow; a great number are restored, and have rejoined their corps.—Much private correspondence between Petersburg and Moscow has made known the situation of the empire. The project of burning Moscow was kept secret. The greater part of the Nobles and individuals knew nothing of it.—The Engineers have drawn out a plan of the city, marking the houses which have been saved from the flames. It appears that there has only been saved from the conflagration the tenth part of the city. Ninetenths of it no longer exist.

*Letter from M. Marcoff, Commandant of the Militia of the province of Moscow, to Count Rastapchin.*

Mojaisk, 24th Aug. (Sept. 5), 1812.

On my arrival at Mojaisk the 21st Aug. (2d Sept.) the head-quarters were at eight wersts from this town. The line of the two united armies was at six wersts. The first army occupied the right, the second the left; the corps of reserve consists of 15 battalions.—The Prince is determined to

(To be continued.)



# ENGLISH LIBERTY OF THE PRESS,

*As illustrated in the Prosecution and Punishment of*

WILLIAM COBBETT.

639]

[640

IN order that my countrymen and that the world may not be deceived, duped, and cheated upon this subject, I, WILLIAM COBBETT, of Botley, in Hampshire, put upon record the following facts; to wit: That, on the 24th June, 1809, the following article was published in a London news-paper, called the *COURIER*:—"The Mutiny amongst the *LO-CAL MILITIA*, which broke out at Ely, was *fortunately* suppressed on Wednesday by the *arrival* of four squadrons of the *GERMAN LEGION CAVALRY* from Bury, under the command of General Auckland. Five of the *ringleaders* were tried by a Court-Martial, and *sentenced to receive 500 lashes each*, part of which *punishment* they received on Wednesday, and *a part* was remitted. *A stoppage for their knap-sacks* was the ground of the complaint that *excited* this mutinous spirit, which occasioned *the men* to surround their officers, and demand *what* they deemed their arrears. The first *division* of the German Legion halted yesterday *at Newmarket* on their return to Bury."—That, on the 1st July, 1809, I published, in the *Political Register*, an article censuring, in the strongest terms, these proceedings; that, for so doing, the Attorney General prosecuted, as seditious libellers, and by Ex-Officio Information, me, and also my printer, my publisher, and one of the principal retailers of the *Political Register*; that I was brought to trial on the 15th June, 1810, and was, by a Special Jury, that is to say, by 12 men out of 48 appointed by the Master of the Crown Office, found guilty; that, on the 20th of the same month, I was compelled to give bail for my appearance to receive judgment; and that, as I came up from Botley (to which place I had returned to my family and my farm on the evening of the 15th), a Tipstaff went down from London in order to seize me, personally; that, on the 9th of July, 1810, I, together with my printer, publisher, and the news-man, were brought into the Court of King's Bench to receive judgment; that the three former were sentenced to be imprisoned for some months in the King's Bench prison; that I was sentenced to be imprisoned for two years in Newgate, the great receptacle for malefactors, and the front of which is the scene of numerous hangings in the course of every year; that the part of the prison in which I was sentenced to be confined is sometimes inhabited by felons, that felons were actually in it at the time I entered it; that one man was taken out of it to be transported in about 48 hours after I was put into the same yard with him; and that it is the place of confinement for men guilty of unnatural crimes, of whom there are four in it at this time; that, besides this imprisonment, I was sentenced to pay a thousand pounds *TO THE KING*, and to give security for my good behaviour for seven years, myself in the sum of 3,000 pounds, and

two sureties in the sum of 1,000 pounds each; that the whole of this sentence has been executed upon me, that I have been imprisoned the two years, have paid the thousand pounds *TO THE KING*, and have given the bail, Timothy Brown and Peter Walker, Esqrs. being my sureties; that the Attorney General was Sir Vicary Gibbs, the Judge who sat at the trial Lord Ellenborough, the four Judges who sat at passing sentence Ellenborough, Grose, Le Blanc, and Bailey; and that the jurors were, Thomas Rhodes of Hampstead Road, John Davis of Southampton Place, James Ellis of Tottenham Court Road, John Richards of Bayswater, Thomas Marsham of Baker Street, Robert Heathcote of High Street Marylebone, John Maud of York Place Marylebone, George Bagster of Church Terrace Pancras, Thomas Taylor of Red Lion Square, David Deane of St. John Street, William Palmer of Upper Street Islington, Henry Favre of Pall Mall; that the Prime Ministers during the time were Spencer Perceval, until he was shot by John Bellingham, and after that Robert B. Jenkinson, Earl of Liverpool; that the prosecution and sentence took place in the reign of King George the Third, and that, he having become insane during my imprisonment, the 1,000 pounds was paid to his son, the Prince Regent, in his behalf; that, during my imprisonment, I wrote and published 364 Essays and Letters upon political subjects; that, during the same time, I was visited by persons from 197 cities and towns, many of them as a sort of deputies from Societies or Clubs; that, at the expiration of my imprisonment, on the 9th of July, 1812, a great dinner was given in London for the purpose of receiving me, at which dinner upwards of 600 persons were present, and at which Sir Francis Burdett presided; that dinners and other parties were held on the same occasion in many other places in England; that, on my way home, I was received at Alton, the first town in Hampshire, with the ringing of the Church bells; that a respectable company met me and gave me a dinner at Winchester; that I was drawn from more than the distance of a mile into Botley by the people; that, upon my arrival in the village, I found all the people assembled to receive me; that I concluded the day by explaining to them the cause of my imprisonment, and by giving them clear notions respecting the flogging of the Local Militia-men at Ely, and respecting the employment of German Troops; and, finally, which is more than a compensation for my losses and all my sufferings, I am in perfect health and strength, and, though I must, for the sake of six children, feel the diminution that has been made in my property (thinking it right in me to decline the offer of a subscription), I have the consolation to see growing up three sons, upon whose hearts, I trust, all these facts will be engraven.

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, July 23, 1812.

Published by R. BAGSHAW, Brydges-Street, Covent-Garden.

LONDON: Printed by J. McCreery, Black-Horse-Court, Fleet-street.